

WETLAND DELINEATION FIELD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire should be completed for each boundary delineation performed. The assumption is that two communities were evaluated, one wetland (= "lower community") and one upland (= "upper community") so that a boundary between them could be identified. Fill in the blanks or check spaces as appropriate. Attach copies of the completed field data forms.

Site Name or Location _____ **Date** _____

Evaluator(s) _____ **Affiliation(s)** _____

General Site Characteristics

Is the site ___ typical or ___ problematic? *If problematic, explain:* _____

Wetland (lower community)

Ecological System: ___ Saline Tidal ___ Fresh Tidal ___ Fresh Nontidal ___ Saline Nontidal

Wetland Type: ___ Forested ___ Shrub ___ Emergent ___ Moss/Lichen ___ Farmed (hay or crop)
___ Other (specify: _____)

HGM Class: ___ Depression ___ Riverine ___ Fringe ___ Slope ___ Flat

Vegetative Cover: ___ Dense ___ Evenly Mixed w/Nonvegetated ___ Sparse

Nonwetland (upper community)

Habitat Type: ___ Forest ___ Shrub ___ Meadow/Prairie ___ Moss/Lichen ___ Farmed
___ Other (specify: _____)

1. Was there a marked difference in the two plant communities? ___ Yes ___ No
2. Was there a gradual change in vegetation between the two communities creating a significant "transition zone" between? ___ Yes ___ No. If so, how wide was this transition zone? _____ feet
3. Was there an abrupt topographic change between the two communities? ___ Yes ___ No

Boundary Determination

Compare results from the two methods: (1) current practice using the 1987 Manual and guidance memos with current local interpretation, and (2) 1987 Manual with the draft Regional Supplement.

1. The wetland boundary was: ___ the same or ___ different.
2. If different, which method produced the boundary higher on the landscape?
___ Manual with current guidance or ___ Manual with Regional Supplement
3. What was the linear distance between the two boundaries? _____ feet
4. What type of indicator(s) were responsible for the difference in the boundaries?
___ Hydrophytic vegetation ___ Hydric soil ___ Wetland hydrology (*check all that apply*)

Assessment of the Indicators

Hydrophytic Vegetation

1. Did the lower community pass the current basic test for hydrophytic vegetation (i.e., >50% of the dominants had an indicator status of FAC or wetter, *excluding FAC-*)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
2. Would the lower community have passed the dominance test if “+” and “-” modifiers on indicator status ratings were not considered (i.e., if FAC- were considered to be FAC)?
☐ Yes ☐ No

3. What other indicators of hydrophytic vegetation were observed in the lower community?

a) List those from the Manual with current guidance: _____

b) List those from the Regional Supplement: _____

4. Was the vegetation in the lower community a problematic wetland community type?

☐ Yes ☐ No. *If so, briefly describe and explain how the problem was handled* _____

5. Did the upper community pass the current basic test for hydrophytic vegetation (i.e., >50% of the dominants had an indicator status of FAC or wetter, *excluding FAC-*)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Would the upper community have passed the dominance test if “+” and “-” modifiers on indicator status ratings were not considered (i.e., if FAC- were considered to be FAC)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. What other indicators of hydrophytic vegetation were observed in the upper community?

a) List those from the Manual with current guidance: _____

b) List those from the Regional Supplement: _____

8. Did both methods reach the same conclusion regarding the presence of hydrophytic vegetation for the upper community? ☐ Yes ☐ No. *If not, briefly explain* _____

9. Were the hydrophytic vegetation indicators in the Regional Supplement clearly described and easy to apply? ☐ Yes ☐ No. *If not, briefly explain* _____

Hydric Soil

1. Did both methods find indicators of hydric soil in the lower community? ___Yes ___No

a) List those from the Manual with current guidance: _____

b) List those from the Regional Supplement: _____

2. Did the lower community contain a problematic hydric soil (i.e., one that lacked indicators)?

___Yes ___No. *If so, briefly describe the problem and explain how it was handled:* _____

3. Did both methods reach the same conclusion regarding the presence of hydric soil in the upper community? ___Yes ___No. *If not, briefly explain* _____

a) List indicators from the Manual with current guidance: _____

b) List indicators from the Regional Supplement: _____

4. Were the hydric soil indicators in the Regional Supplement clearly described and easy to apply? ___Yes ___No. *If not, briefly explain* _____

Wetland Hydrology

1. Did both methods determine that wetland hydrology was present in the lower community?

(Requires 1 primary indicator or 2 secondary indicators.) ___Yes ___No

a) List indicators from the Manual with current guidance:

Primary: _____ Secondary: _____

b) List indicators from the Regional Supplement:

Primary: _____ Secondary: _____

2. Did the lower community contain a problematic wetland hydrology situation (i.e., one that lacked indicators)?

___Yes ___No. *If so, briefly describe the problem and explain how it was handled:* _____

3. Did both methods reach the same conclusion regarding wetland hydrology for the upper community? ___Yes ___No. *If not, briefly explain* _____

a) List indicators from the Manual with current guidance:

Primary: _____ Secondary: _____

b) List indicators from the Regional Supplement:

Primary: _____ Secondary: _____

4. Were the wetland hydrology indicators in the Regional Supplement clearly described and easy to apply? ___Yes ___No. *If not, briefly explain* _____

General Comments on the Regional Supplement

1. Were the indicators and procedures in the Supplement clear and easy to apply?

___Yes ___No. *If not, how could they be improved?* _____

2. In your opinion, did the Regional Supplement make this wetland determination more defensible? ___Yes ___No. *Briefly explain* _____

3. Based on your testing, do you want to recommend other indicators that should be considered for further evaluation? ☐ Yes ☐ No. *List by indicator type:* _____

4. Was the Regional Supplement's field data form complete, understandable, and easy to fill out? ☐ Yes ☐ No. *If not, how could it be improved?* _____

5. Any additional comments or suggestions? _____
